DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 955 CS 502 914

AUTHOR Todd-Mancillas, William R.
TITLE Man-Linked Words and Masculine Pronouns: A Review of Literature and Implications for Speech and Communication Teachers and Researchers.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (71st, Ocean City, MD, April 24-26, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; Higher Education; Language Attitudes; *Language Research; *Language Usage; Literature Reviews; Oral Language; *Sex Bias; Social Attitudes; *Speech Communication

ABSTRACT

Empirical studies that demonstrate probable gender biased perceptions resulting from the use of man-linked words and third-person, singular masculine pronouns are reviewed in this paper. Among the findings revealed by the review are: (1) there is a tendency for people to perceive man-linked words as more likely to refer to men than to women; (2) there is a tendency for people to perceive nonhuman-linked words as referring with approximately equal likelihood to both men and women; (3) the traditional generic "he" is not perceived as referring with equal likelihood to both male and female referents; (4) alternative pronoun constructions are perceived as neither more difficult to understand nor less esthetically pleasing than traditional generics; and (5) students may learn to model teachers' oral usage of nontraditional generics. The paper makes suggestions for the adoption of alternatives to masculine generics in speech and communication teaching and research reporting, as well as suggestions for research and development activities. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186955

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Man-Linked Words and Masculine Pronouns: A Review of Literature and Implications for Speech and Communication Teachers and Researchers

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William R. Todd-Mancillas
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By

William R. Todd-Mancillas
Department of Human Communication
Rutgers University

Abstract

This article reviews empirical based studies demonstrating gender biased perceptions resulting from use of man-linked words (e.g., mankind) and third person, singular masculine pronouns. Contrary to common-sense beliefs, neither of these language conventions have been found to be associated with equal likelihood perceptions of female and male referents.

Specific suggestions are made for the adoption of alternatives to masculine generics in speech and communication teaching and research reportage. Also, suggestions are made for research and development activities.

This paper was presented before the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, April 24-26, 1980, Ocean City, Maryland, and was rated #1 among the top three for the Instructional Practices Division.

CS502 9/4

In recent years, many articles have been written emphasizing the need to reduce sexism in American society.[1] Pursuant to this objective, many communication scholars are seriously attending to the content and form of communication instruction. Karre[2] lists twenty-six activities for grades K through college, intended to heighten students' and teachers' sensitivity toward sex stereotyping and their potentially deleterious effects. Sprague argues that there are essentially two functions of education: one is to transfer information; the other is to encourage students to puruse their own individual potential and constructively surmount the constraints, including socially prescribed sex roles, which make it difficult for people to actualize their potential.[3] Sprague further explains that there are two ways in which communication educators can reduce the impact of sexism. One is in the careful selection of textbooks, as there are many which are biased in their portrayal of sex roles through content, pictures, and writing style.[4] Another is for communication educators to "behave" in non-sexist ways, thereby, providing appropriate behavioral models for students to follow.

As prerequisites to following Sprague's advice that communication educators model behaviors they want their students to adopt, it is first necessary to answer two questions: (1) What are the preferred (nonsexist) behaviors?, and (2) How do we know that these are the preferred behaviors? The purposes of the present article are to offer partial answers to these questions with respect to one of the most pervasive of language behaviors-- usage of man-linked words (e.g., mankind),

and third person, singular masculine generics (mainly, he, his, him, and himself).

While some people are aware of the philosophical and humanistic arguments vying against usage of man-linked words and masculine pronouns,[5] fewer persons are aware of the empirical studies already done, demonstrating probable gender biased perceptions resulting from their use. A consideration of these studies is important, as their findings suggest strongly their discountinued use in favor of various alternatives.

Man-Linked Words and Masculine Pronouns: A Review of Literature

Bem and Bem conducted two studies investigating the effects of man-linked words in job advertisements.[6] In the first study, 120 high school seniors (60 men, 60 women) were divided into three groups, with each group reading 12 job advertisements: appliance sales, telephone operator, photographer, travel agent, telephone frameman, dental assistant, taxicab driver, telephone service representative, assistant buyer, keypunch operator, telephone lineman, and public relations advertising. In the sex-biased (man-linked) condition, telephone framemen and linemen were described as "men" who have the opportunity to work with other "craftsmen" and enjoy the outdoors. Telephone operators and service representatives were described as "women" who place complex long distance phone calls, and the "girl to talk to" when needing special telephone services. In the sex-unbiased condition, advertisements were written to appeal to both men and women. The third condition was sex-reversed in that job

advertisements were written to appeal to the sex least frequently employed in those positions. Analysis of the data indicated that in the sex-biased condition, only 5% of the women and 30% of the men were interested in applying for "opposite-sex" jobs. However, these percentages increased to 25% and 75% in the sex-unbiased and 45% and 65% in the sex-reversed conditions. Similar results were obtained for male respondents. Accordingly, Bem and Bem concluded that "sex bias in the content of a job advertisement does serve to aid and abet discrimination by discouraging both men and women from applying for 'opposite-sex' jobs."

In Bem and Bem's second study, 52 female college students rated 32 job advertisements taken from The Pittsburg Press.[7] Sixteen of these advertisements were taken from the Jobs-Male Interest column. Half of the subjects read the advertisements segregated into male and female interest categories. The remaining subjects read these same advertisements, written in a nonsegregated format. In the segregated condition, only 46% of the subjects were as likely to apply for "male interest" jobs as for "female interest" jobs, as opposed to 86% of the subjects preferring "male interest" jobs in the nonsegregated condition.

As with most of the studies that follow, the results of the Bem and Bem studies support the propositions that: a) man-linked words are not perceived as referring with equal likelihood to men and women, and b) usage of man-linked words may cause women to perceive their behavioral options as more limited than they actually are.

Schneider and Hacker obtained behavioral (non-paper and pencil) response data, further supporting Bem and Bem's findings.[8] Three-hundred, six sociology students submitted photographs from newspapers and magazines they thought appropriate for illustrating chapters in an introductory sociology text. Half of the subjects received a list of nonman-linked chapter titles: "Culture," "Population," "Race and Minority Groups," "Family," "Crime and Delinquency," "Violence and Social Unrest," "Ecology," and"Social Theory." The remaining subjects received man-linked chapter titles: "Social Man," "Urban Man," "Political Man," "Industrial Man," and "Economic Man." Sixty-four percent of the subjects receiving man-linked titles submitted photographs depicting men only, while only about 50% of the subjects receiving nonman-linked titles submitted photographs depicting males only.

In Kidd's study, 68 subjects identified the gender of persons discussed in 18 declarative sentences (e.g., "The potentialities of man are infinitely varied and exciting."[9] Nine of the sentences were followed by open-ended questions allowing subjects to describe in their own words the gender of the persons discussed in the sentences. The second set of nine sentences were followed by forced-choice alternatives. Among responses to the open-ended questions, 66% of the subjects identified male referents and 5% identified female referents, with 29% identifying referents neither exclusively male nor female. In the forced-choice condition, 86% of the subjects identified male referents and 9% identified female referents. In both conditions, then, subject responses indicated little tendency for interpreting man-linked words

as referring with equal likelihood to men and women.

In addition to investigating interpretability of man-linked and nonman -linked words, Shimanoff also measured the degree of masculinity and femininity associated with them.[10] One hundred and eighty male and female college students were divided equally into three groups. After reading sentences referencing man-linked ("chairman") and nonman-linked ("chairperson," and "individual") target persons, subjects identified the gender and rated the masculinity/femininity of the target persons. The results indicated that males were more prone than females to identify male referents when the word "chairperson" was used and that there were only slight differences in the degree of masculinity/femininity associated with man-linked versus nonman-linked words

Gottfredson studied the impact of man-linked words in paper and pencil tests of vocational interest.[11] Ninety-four females, enrolled in a private, college preparatory girls school, responded to experimental forms of Hollands Vocational Preference Inventory and Self-Directed Search, a guidance simulations. These instruments were altered to include four parallel forms of man-linked and nonman-linked items: draftsman/draftswoman; life insurance salesman/life insurance salesperson; policeman, police officer; real estate salesman, real estate salesperson. Analysis of the data indicated no systematic tendency for the nonman-linked items to receive higher interest scores than man-linked items.

In summary, four out of five of the above studies yielded results demonstrating a tendency for people to perceive man-linked words as more likely to refer to men than women, and a dissimilar tendency for people

to perceive nonman-linked words as referring with approximately equal likelihood to men and women. A fifth study yielded results suggesting nonsignificant differences in the interpretative character of man-linked and non-man linked words.

A second line of research has focused on what have been traditionally defined as generic pronouns; i.e., "he," "him," "his," "himself", attempting to assess whether they are interpreted as referring with equal likelihood to men and women, and whether they are equally as comprehensible and esthetically pleasing as two laternative approaches to pronoun usage. The two alternative approaches may be thought of as "noncontrived" and "contrived." Noncontrived approaches make use of existing pronouns, but arrange them in such a way as to explicitly indicate their referencing equally women and men. Examples of noncontrived usages include "him or her," "her or his," "he/she," "she/he," "him or herself," and "s/he." Contrived alternatives are new pronouns, not merely nonstandard usages of already existing pronouns, which also have as their intended function the explicit referencing of both men and women. For example, Densmore recommends the adoption of "herm," meaning "her or him," and "heris," meaning "her or his."[12]

In Soto, Forslund, and Cole's study, 144 student subjects (72 men, 72 women) were divided equally into six groups.[13] Groups differed from one another in the type of pronouns used in the essay: traditional generic "he," alternative generic "she," alternative generics "he/she" and "she/he," alternative generics "tay" (he or she), "ter" (her or his), and "tem" (him or her), and alternative generics "se" (she or he), "hes"

(his or her), and "hir" (her or him). Subjects perceived the word "he" as referring significantly more frequently to men than women, but there were nonsignificant differences among the essays in their perceived quality or comprehensibility.

Martyna investigated the possibility of people being more likely to use alternatives to traditional generics when writing rather than speaking.[14] Forty subjects (20 men; 20 women) read six male related, six neutral, and six female related sentence fragments, with an equal number in each category requiring written and oral completions. For example:

Male-Related - Before a judge can give a final ruling, _____

Neutral - When a person loses money, _____

Female-Related - After a nurse has completed training, _____

The results indicated male subjects were more likely than females to use "he" in completions of male-related and neutral sentence fragments; female subjects were more likely than males to use alternative generics ("she," "he or she," "they") when completing neutral sentence fragments; and for both male and female subjects, gender-specific pronouns were more likely to be used in completing male-related and female-related sentence fragments.

Moulton, Robinson, and Elias assigned 226 male and 264 female students to three different conditions, wherein subjects wrote brief narratives of target persons appearing in one sentence assertions.[15] In the traditional generic condition, subjects read either the sentence,

"In a large coeducational institutiton the average student will feel isolated in (his) introductory courses;" or "Most people are concerned with appearance. Each person knows when (his) appearance is unattractive." In the nonconcontrived alternative conditions, subjects read these same sentences, but with the pronoun "his" substituted by either the word "their" or "his or her." The results indicated a significantly greater tendency for subjects to write essays describing male referents in the traditional generic condition than in either of the noncontrived alternative conditions.

In an unpublished study, Meyers obtained evidence suggesting that nontraditional generics are neither more difficult to comprehend nor perceived as less esthetically pleasing than traditional generics.[16] Three hundred and fifty-eight university student subjects were divided into three groups, each group reading a different form of an essay on magic. One form used traditional generics ("his"); the second form used the noncontrived alternative "s/he;" the third form used the contrived alternative "tey," meaning she or he. After reading the essay, subjects completed a comprehension test and rated the esthetic quality of the essays. Neither the comprehension scores nor the esthetic ratings varied significantly as a function of variations in generics. In a follow-up essay, subjects described their perceptions of the target persons appearing in the essays, and there were nonsignificant differences among the groups with respect to usage of traditional generics versus noncontrived or contrived alternatives

The results of Adamsky's study suggest that students may model teachers' usage of nontraditional generics.[17] Adamsky taught two sections of a child psychology course (n = 74), in which she made conscious oral usage of the alternative generic "she." Toward the end of the course, student papers were analyzed for usage of the nontraditional generic "she." The results indicated the students used the "she" in their papers significantly more frequently than control subjects.

Taken together, the results of the above five studies suggest: the traditional generic "he" is not perceived as referring with equal likelihood to male and female referents; alternative pronoun constructions are perceived as neither more difficult to understand nor less esthetically pleasing than traditional generics; and students may learn to model teachers' oral usage of nontraditional generics.

Implications of Literature Review Findings

On the basis of the findings discussed above, one must doubt the appropriateness of referring to man-linked words and third person masculine pronouns as true generics. Conversely, these same findings suggest that alternative word and pronoun constructions are more likely to elicit equal likelihood perceptions of men and women, but in the absence of reduced comprehension or esthetic appeal. Specific recommendations follow on how communication scholars can act upon the above conclusions in their teaching and research.

Prior to making specific recommendations, it is first necessary to describe the range of possible change options and criteria suitable for

distinguishing more from less preferred alternatives. This is a crucial first step in effective educational diffusion processes, and assures increased accuracy, efficiency, and fairness in decision making.[18]

There are essentially three categories of alternatives to the conventional man-linked and third person, singular masculine pronoun generics: alternatives that use existing language options to circumvent the usage of man-linked words and masculine pronouns, alternatives that are more-or-less obviously interpretable neologisms; alternatives that are neologisms not obviously interpretable, and which require more learning effort for senders/receivers than either of the first two categories.

Examples of the first category include: a) pluralizing sentence subjects, as in the statement, "Students will be penalized for not turning in their work on time," as opposed to "A student will be penalized for not turning in his work on time;"[19] b) substitution of "man," "mankind," and "manmade" with words having unmarked gender,[20] such as "people," "citizens," "inhabitants," "human beings," "individuals," and "manufactured items" instead of "manmade items;"[21] c) usage of the indefinite one, as in "One can improve one's grade through extra credit," rather than "A student may improve his grade through extra credit;"[22] d)usage of the third person, plural pronouns "they" or "their" in lieu of the third person singular pronouns he, she, his, or her, as in, "Any student has the right to appeal their grade," rather than "Any student has the right to appeal his grade;"[23] e) avoidance of man-linked words where there already exist suitable alternatives, as in the recommended usage of "firefighter" rather than "fireman."[24]

Examples of the second category include usage of the terms "s/he," "wo/men," "chairperson," "salesperson," "personkind;" parallel constructions drawing explicit attention to both male and female referents, such as "he or she," "women and men," and "his or hers;"[25] and alternating usage of masculine and feminine third person, singular pronouns, "she" in some sentences, "he" in others, but with the intention that either pronoun reference both men and women.[26]

The third category consists largely of proposals made for new third person, singular pronouns. Miller and Swift suggested the adoption of "tay" (he or she), "ter" (her or him), "tem" (him or her), and "genkind" (people in general).[27] Densmore proposed "she" (she or he), "herm" (him or her), and "heris" (her or his).[28] Cole suggested "se" (he or she), "hes" (her or his), and "hir" (him or her).[29]

All these suggestions share one goal in common, an increased probability of referencing with equal likelihood both women and men. However, they differ strikingly from one another in the extent to which they manifest the McLuhan proposition that their manner of change is itself the message.[30] For instance, the pluralizing of subjects does not in itself call attention to the fact that this change is being made as a means of rectifying a previously and currently existing social inequality. The pluralizing merely results in an increased probability of referencing both men and women. However, the introduction of words "herm" and "heris" make clear by virtue of their saliency, that a dramatic change is taking place in order to correct a previously and currently existing social inequality. It is not being argued here that

either of these objectives is superior to the other, but rather that one must have clearly fixed in mind and stated in purpose which of these objectives is most important when selecting from among options, those most suited to one's needs.

Associated with the necessity of specifying change objectives is the need to consider pragmatics regarding the diffusion of any innovation. In consequence of literally hundreds of empirical studies in at least a dozen different disciplines, we conclude with some confidence that those innovations are most likely to succeed which require minimal learning, that we are maximally similar to the behavior being replaced, and, when adopted, result in maximum reinforcement and minimal punishment.[31] Applying these criteria to the range of generic alternatives available to us, it is clear that the neologisms "heris" and "herm" are less likely to find acceptance and permanent adoption than the less contrived alternatives such as pluralizing the subject.

Again it is not being argued here that one should necessarilly opt for those alternatives most clearly meeting the above pragmatic criteria, but rather that one should understand clearly the differences in difficulty encountered when attempting to implement generic changes noticeably more or less complex than other alternatives. In this author's opinion, increased consciousness raising about the previously existing social inequities is important, but not so much as to warrant the high risk of failure associated with extremely novel changes; i.e., ones that are highly dissimilar from previously existing generics, which would require considerable learning, and which even if learned, would soon be

forgotten if not continuously reinforced in an atmosphere devoid of punishment. Accordingly, it is this author's preference to use *via media* alternatives such as "s/he" or "he/she," which are somewhat contrived and signal departures from previous conventions, but which are not so radically different they require untoward adjustments for senders/receivers. Of course, this is a preference based on the author's personal value system and will not be reflective of the needs and values of all persons reading this report. On the basis of above criteria, pragmatics, and forthcoming discussions and research findings, readers will decide for themselves which among the possible options are most appropriate for meeting their objectives, What is more important than building a case for adoption of particular alternatives is the need to incorporate at least some language changes more clearly associated with generic interpretations than what has been previously availed through usage of man-linked words and third person masculine pronouns. At minimum, these changes would occur in three contexts, the classroom, selection of curriculum materials (textbooks), and in the conducting and reporting of research.

Language in the classroom

Adamsky has obtained partial evidence for students learning alternatives to masculine generics in consequence of their exposure to a teacher's usage of alternatives during inclass discourse.[32] In addition, when asked about their attitudes toward these changes, students reported increased sensitivity to social inequalities resulting from usage of masculine generics. Although this study needs replication---it is the

first of its type--the findings are nonetheless suggestive of constructive changes resulting from teachers' inclass usage of alternatives to masculine generics.

Determining which change options are preferred is a research and development objective, which could easily occupy the attention of communication researchers during these next several years. It would be particularly useful to have more information regarding differences, if any, in perceived comprehension and esthetic quality of the various alternative change options. Information is also needed about student attitudes toward teachers using alternative generics, and whether these attitudes vary significantly as a function of the particular alternative adopted.

In the absence of empirical evidence identifying preferred alternatives, it is recommended here that the least difficult-to-learn and understand alternatives be implemented rather than the completely new alternatives. Specifically, teachers should at least minimize their dependence on masculine generics by adopting the avoidance strategies listed in category I. And when one needs to identify particular person referents, the less contrived alternatives listed in category II are preferred over those listed in category III.

Language in Curriculum Materials

While guidelines for the nonsexist writing of textbooks have been extant for several years,[33] and nearly all make specific statements of the manner in which masculine generics should be replaced by specified

alternatives, there nonetheless remain in use many speech and communication textbooks written using masculine generics. A few examples follow:

1. Loren Reid's Speaking Well (McGraw-Hill, 1977), pg. 24: "You have heard an instructor say, 'This morning I am going to demonstrate the solution to Problem 97,' a sentence that can be described as feedforward, since the instructor has told you in advance what he was going to do. Perhaps you reacted with some feedback..., telling him with an interested look what you thought of his plan..."
2. Gary Cronkhite's Communication and Awareness (Cummings Publishing Company, 1976), pg. 4: "Human beings learn to communicate so easily and so early that they soon forget what they are doing. A child by the age of four has most of the basic tools he needs to communicate. For the next few years his parents, teachers, and peers work to socialize his communication -- to teach him how to use it. But they teach him every day in such subtle ways that he is barely aware of what he is doing." pg. 5: "Communication is mankind's most effective tool."
3. Charles R. Grunner, Cal Logue, Dwight L. Freshley, and Richard Huseman's Speech Communication in Society (Allyn and Bacon, 1977), pg. 43: "The effective speaker uses a clear oral style, not by writing out his speech word for word but by outlining thoughts carefully and knowing the material well without becoming wedded to exact wordings."

The above books are to be contrasted with other recently published speech and communication textbooks, using alternatives to masculine generics. Among them are Bonnie Johnson's Communication: The Process of Organizing (Allyn and Bacon, 1977), James C. McCroskey and Lawrence R. Wheeless' Introduction to Human Communication (Allyn and Bacon, 1976), Roy Berko, Andrew Wolvin, and Darlyn Wolvin's Communicating: A Social and Career Focus (Houghton Mifflin, 1979), and Raymond Ross' Essentials of Speech Communication (Prentice-Hall, 1979).

Given a choice between using two texts of approximately equal relevance and caliber, with one using masculine generics and the other using alternatives, the latter is the preferred choice. Communication educators have not only the opportunity, but responsibility, to opt in favor of those texts using alternatives to masculine generics. As Sprague has argued elsewhere,[34] communication educators, perhaps more so than instructors of other disciplines, are in a position of influencing student behavior in such fashion as to undo societal influences restricting men's and women's behavioral options. And one of the easiest and most effective ways to do this is to select texts minimizing gender role stereotyping, of which the use of masculine generics is one salient manifestation.

Communication researchers should note that to date there has not yet been published a content analysis of the status of women in speech and communication textbooks. To conduct and report such a study would have at least two valuable outcomes. It would serve as a "buying guide" for those educators concerned with eliminating, or at least reducing to

a minimal level, gender role bias in teaching materials. This study would also serve as index of current bias, and when compared with the results of future replications, would indicate the extent of progress being made in reducing gender role bias in curriculum materials.

Of course, all aspects of the above discussion pertain equally as well to any written materials distributed to students, including syllabi, handouts, worksheets, exams, memoranda, etc. Specific comments have been confined to textbooks, merely because they are the most public of written curriculum materials.

Language in Research Reportage

Researchers should avoid the use of masculine generics in the reporting of research activities. While this might seem an obvious implication, and while several speech and communication journal editors have made public statements about the unacceptability of manuscripts written using masculine generics,[35] there remains at least one noticeable exception, The Southern Speech Journal. Note, for instance, the title of the lead article appearing in fall, 1978 issue of SSCJ: J. Donald Ragsdale's "The Speech Communication Teacher as Spokesman: A Rhetorical View of Research and Teaching."[36] More specifically, Professor Ragsdale advises us:

> ....I would characterize the ideal research-oriented teacher by the word spokesman, and I would say he is the criterial rhetor of our day. As I use the word spokesman here, I intend it to have a meaning similar to that of defendant in the Classical Greek legal sense. This teacher has

first hand knowledge. He is not dependent only upon his own scholarship, but neither is he subordinate to that of others. When he speaks, it is with the force of authority. He alone can keep his students on the far shore of knowledge. Unlike virtually any other speaker in today's society, this teacher is a spokesman in the truest sense. He exemplifies all of the ideals implied in the Classical canons of rhetoric, especially the canon of invention." (underscripts added)

Of course, it might be assumed that Professor Ragsdale's article was intended to reference both female and male speech and communication professionals, and that common-sense dictates these intentions. But we have already reviewed considerable empirical evidence suggesting the fallacy of this common-sense intention. And where common-sense intentions vie with replicated research findings, one might refer back to J. A. Winans' observation that: "In every field common-sense resists the investigator; for common-sense is a stand-patter. Frequently common-sense is right in the long run; and frequently one investigator overthrows another, whereat common-sense rejoices. Yet it is largely due to the investigator that progress is made,.... For it is simply not true that common observation reveals all the truth." [37] These comments appeared in the opening pages of the first issue of The Quarterly Journal of Speech, nearly seventy years ago, and still stand as sound advice for those wishing to modify effectively their communication behaviors. Since we have abundant evidence indicating nongenericness of masculine generics, it is in keeping with Professor Winans' comments that our journals make every

effort to exclude from publication manuscripts written with masculine generics.

While the above example is an increasing rarity among published articles, there still are scholars in our field insistent upon using masculine generics in convention papers. During the 1978 ICA convention, Peter Andersen discussed this problem while critiquing two papers for the Interpersonal Communication Division.[38] Because both papers reported studies using male and female subjects, and both were written using masculine generics, it was impossible to determine whether the findings obtained equally for men and women, or only male subjects. Andersen's suggestion is that masculine generics be used only when needed to distinguish male from female respondents for the purpose of clarifying research findings.

SUMMARY

While our present understanding of sexist language dynamics is still limited, there nonetheless exist sufficient data based information establishing the nongenericness of traditional masculine generics to discourage their use in most phases of speech and communication teaching and research. Among the ten studies reviewed, only one fails to obtain evidence demonstrating tendencies for people to perceive man-linked words and third person, singular masculine generics as referencing more frequently men than women. Moreover, this same data base suggests the absence of this tendency when alternatives to masculine generics are used. Accordingly, specific suggestions were

made for the adoption of alternatives in all phases of one's teaching activities, specifically including the modification of inclass oral discourse with students and selection and construction of curriculum materials. Also, speech and communication researchers are encouraged to report their research activities using alternatives to masculine generics both for reasons of avoidance of gender role biases as well as increased accuracy in reportage.

Footnotes

[1]See for instance, "Growing up Girlish," Trans/action, (November-December, 1970); Pauline S. Bart, "Why Women See the Future Differently from Men," in Learning for Tomorrow the Role of the Future in Education, ed. Alvin Toffler (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), p. 55; Amitai Etzioni, "The Women's Movement--Tokens Vs. Objectives," Saturday Review, 20 May 1972, pp. 31-35; Wilma Scott Heide, "Feminism: The Sine Qua Non for a Just Society," Vital Speeches, 38 (1972), 403; Myra Sadker, "Are You Guilty of Teaching Sex Bias?" Instructor, 82 (August/September, 1972), 81; Teresa E. Levitin, Robert P. Quinn, and Graham L. Staines, "A Woman is 58% of a Man," Psychology Today, 7 (March, 1973), 89-91; Judith Davis, "Do Men Need Women's Liberation?" Psychiatry, 37 (November, 1974), 387-400; Warren Farrell, The Liberated Man: Freeing Men and Their Relationships With Women (New York: Random House, 1974); Agate Nesaule Krouse and Barbara Taylor Desmarais, "Why Discuss Men in Sexist Society," Women's Studies Newsletter, 2 (Fall-Winter, 1975), 12-13; Tony Schwartz, "Women and Men: No More Absolutes," Change, 6 (October, 1974), 24-28; Anne Steinmann and David J. Fox, The Male Dilemma: How to Survive the Sexual Revolution (New York: J. Aronson, 1974); Sandra Lipsitz Bem,"Beyond Androgyny: Some Presumptuous Prescriptions for a Liberated Sexual Identity," Paper presented at the APA-NIMH Conference on The Research Needs of Women, Madison, Wisconsin, May 31, 1975: Norma Costrich, Joan Feinstein, and Louise Kiddler, "When Stereotypes Hurt: Three Studies of Penalties for Sex-Role Reversals," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11 (November, 1975), 520-530; and Gerald Marwell,

"Why Ascription? Parts of a More of Less Formal Theory of the Functions and Dysfunctions of Sex Roles," Sociological Review, 40 (August, 1975), 445-455.

[2] Idahlynn Karre, "Stereotyped Sex Roles and Self-Concept: Strategies for Liberating the Sexes," Communication Education, 25 (January, 1976), 43-52.

[3] Jo Sprague, "The Reduction of Sexism in Speech Communication Education," The Speech Teacher, 24 (January, 1975), 37-45.

[4] See for instance, Marjorie B. U'Ren, "The Image of Women in Textbooks," Women in Sexist Society: Studies in Power and Powerlessness, eds. Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971), p. 326.

[5] Representative articles include, Julie Coryell, "What's in a Name?" Women: A Journal of Liberation, 2 (1971), 59; Aileen Hernandex, "The Preening of America," Star News, 1 January, 1971; E. Merriam, "Sex and Semantics," in Liberation Now, eds., D. Babcox and M. Belkin (New York: Dell, 1971; Ethel Strainchamps, "Our Sexist Language," in Women in a Sexist Society, eds., Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran (New York: Basic Books, 1971), 240-250; Haig A. Bosmajian, "The Language of Sexism" ETC.: A Review of General Semantics, 29 (September, 1972), 305-313; Casey Miller and Kate Swift, "One Small Step for Genkind," New York Times, 16 April, 1976, p. 39; H. Lee Gershuny, "Sexist Semantics in the Dictionary," ETC.: A Review of General Semantics, 31 (June, 1974), 159-169; Robin Lakoff, "You Are What You Say," Ms., 3 (July, 1974), 65-67; Sol Saporta, "Language in Sexist Society," ERIC, ED 098 832 (1974); Barbara A. Bate,

"Generic Man; Invisible Woman: Language, Thought, and Social Change," ERIC, ED 105 542 (1975); Robert Hefner, Rebecca Meda, and Barbara Oleshansky, "Development of Sex Role Transcendence," Human Development, 18 (1975), 143-158; Lynda Kahn, "Sexism in Everyday Speech," Social Work, 20 (January, 1975), 65-67; and I. M. Tiedt, "Sexism in Language, an Editor's Plague," Elementary English, 50 (1975), 1073-1074.

[6] Sandra L. Bem and Daryl J. Bem, "Does Sex-biased Job Advertising 'Aid and Abet' Sex Discrimination?" Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 3 (1973), 6-18.

[7] Ibid., pp. 14-18.

[8] Joseph W. Schneider and Sally L. Hacker, "Sex Role Imagery and Use of the Generic 'Man' in Introductory Texts: A Case in the Sociology of Sociology," The American Sociologist, 8 (1973), 12-18.

[9] Virginia Kidd, "A Study of the Images Produced Through the Use of the Male Pronoun as the Generic," Moments in Contemporary Rhetoric and Communication 1 (1971), 25-30.

[10] Susan B. Shimanoff, "English Lexical Gender and the Perception of Sex Markedness," paper presented at the 46th annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Newport Beach, California, November, 1975.

[11] Gary D. Gottfredson, "A note on sexist wording on interest measurement. Measurement and Evaluation of Guidance, 8 (1976), 221-223.

[12] Dana Densmore, "Speech is a Form of Thought," 10 pages. KNOW, Inc., P. O. Box 10197, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15232.

[13] Debbie Halon Soto, Evelyn Florio Forslund, and Claudia Cole, "Alternatives to Using Masculine Pronouns When Referring to the Species," paper presented at the 46th annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, California, November, 1975.

[14] Wendy Martyna, "What Does 'He' Mean?" Journal of Communication, 28 (1978), 131-138.

[15] Janice Moulton, George M. Robinson, and Elias Cherin, "Sex Bias in Language Use," American Psychologist, 33 (1978), 1032-1036.

[16] Karen Ann Meyers, "The Effects of Inclusive/Exclusive Language on Reading Comprehension, Perceived Aesthetic Quality and Likelihood of Adoption of Inclusive Pronoun Usage," unpublished senior honor's thesis, University 1979.*

[17] Cathryn Adamsky, "Changes in Pronominal Usage in a Classroom Situation," Psychology of Women Quarterly, accepted for publication, 1980.

[18] Ronald Havelock, The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

[19] Janice M. Birk, Laura Barbanel, Linda Brooks, Michele H. Herman, Joseph B. Juhasz, Robert A. Seltzer, and Sandra S. Tangri. "Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language," American Psychologist, 30 (1975), 682-684; Random House Guidelines for Multiethnic/Nonsexist Survey (New York, New York: Ramdom House, 1976).

[20] Elizabeth Burr, Susan Dunn, and Norma Farquhar, "The Language of Inequality," ETC.: A Review of General Semantics, 29 (1972), 414-416.

* The name of the sponsoring university is being withheld at this time to maintain author anonymity.

[21] Random House.

[22] Birk, Barbanel, Brooks, Herman, Juhasz, Seltzer, and Tangri.

[23] M. R. Dressman, "Possibilities and Problems of the Written Dialect," Paper presented at the 14th meeting of the Southeastern Conference on Linguistics, Atlanta, Georgia, November, 1975. Paper cited in Maija S. Blaubergs', "Changing the Sexist Language: The Theory Behind the Practice," Psychology of Women Quarterly, 2 (1978), 244-261. Also discussed in Random House Guidelines.

[24] Carole Schulte Johnson and Inga Kromann Kelly, " 'HE' and 'SHE': Changing Language to fit a Changing World," Educational Leadership, 32 (1975), 527-530.

[25] Harriet B. Stephenson, "De-Stereotyping Personnel Language," Personnel Journal, 54 (1975), 334-335. William R. Todd-Mancillas, "The Generic 'Man': A Review of Literature and Implications for Communication Scholars," Paper presented at the 29th meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1978.

[26] N. J. Shepelak, "Does 'he' mean 'she' too? The Case of the Generic Anomaly," Paper presented at the 4th National Conference on Feminist Psychology, St. Louis, Missouri, February 3, 1977. Paper cited in Maija S. Blaubergs. Linda Costigan Lederman has recently implemented this technique in her book, New Dimensions (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1977).

[27] Casey Miller and Kate Swift, "De-Sexing the English Language," Ms: The New Magazine for Women, preview issue, Spring, 1972, p. 7.

[28] Densmore.

[29] Claudia Cole, "The Gender Trap," Unpublished manuscript cited in Soto, Forslund, and Cole.

[30] Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media (New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966).

[31] Everett M. Rogers and F. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations (New York, New York: The Free Press, 1971).
William R. Todd-Mancillas and Robert J. Kibler, "A Review and Critical Analysis of the Literature Pertaining to the Diffusion of Educational Innovations," Paper presented at the 25th annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1975.

[32] Adamsky.

[33] See, for instance, Guidelines for Equal Treatment of the Sexes in McGraw Hill Book Company Publications (New York, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1974), Random House Guidelines for Multiethnic/ Nonsexist Survey, and Guidelines for Improving the Image of Women in Textbooks (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1972).

[34] Sprague.

[35] For instance, Mark Knapp, editor for Human Communication Research, has recently advised contributors that, "The use of the generic 'he' should be avoided. If the referent for the pronoun is not exclusively male, use 'he/she,' 'her/him,' or other appropriate terms." This statement appeared in "Notice to Contributors," Human Communication Research, 5 (1979), ii.

[36] J. Donald Ragsdale, "The Speech Communication Teacher as Spokesman:

A Rhetorical View of Research and Teaching," The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 44 (1978), 1-10.

[37] J. A. Winans, "The Need for Research," The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, 1 (1915), 17-23.

[38] Peter A. Andersen, "A Discussion and Critique of the Relationship Development Process Panel," Paper presented at the 28th annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1978.